



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/938,706 09/26/97 KUBOMURA

K 1221290HJS

EXAMINER

021171
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON DC 20001

TM02/0730

PAULA, C
ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176
DATE MAILED:

07/30/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 08/938,706	Applicant(s) KUBOMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner CESAR B PAULA	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 5/14/2001.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment claims 27-36 have been added. Claims 1-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11-15, and 27 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 9/26/97 have been approved by the draftsman.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 10, and 17-23 are objected to because of the following informalities: *memory means for storing the coordinate of at least a charactersaid second intended area and are.* The verb “are” seems to be inappropriately referring to “character or image” in a plural manner instead of a singular way . Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 5, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is still unclear how the character displayed in the “second intended area” is “larger, equal, smaller” than itself? The claims seem to refer to resizing a “second intended area” which is “larger, equal, smaller” than itself. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. Claims 27-31, and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Morgan et al, hereinafter Morgan (Pat. # 5,943,679, 8/99).

Regarding independent claim 27, Morgan discloses: *transforming a size and a scale of an original view* --"changing a font for an object in the graphical user interface....A set of related objects within the interface can also be changed according to the new font" (col. 1, ln. 55-67, col. 2, ln. 1-10, and Fig. 4A-B). Morgan teaches the resizing or transformation of an input field (76), or button (77), which displays clipped fonts, enlarged or resized in a window area extending beyond the viewable area (Fig. 3B).

Moreover, Morgan discloses: *selecting a region within the second view....capturing an original character size*--"A new font is being dragged from the font palette 71 and is about to be dropped on the window 70" (col. 1, ln. 55-67, col. 4, ln. 4-67, and Fig. 4A-B). Morgan teaches the selection, and capturing of original fonts into a region with an input field (76), or button (77).

Moreover, Morgan discloses: *detecting an opening of a window containing the region....adjusting the magnification ratio responsive to a user preference...character size, the magnification ratio, and a display size*--"A new font is being dragged from the font paletteThe window 70 and the client area 74, the entry fields 76 and buttons 77 have all been resized " (col. 4, ln. 30-67, and Fig. 4A-B). Morgan teaches the opening of an input field (76) or button

Art Unit: 2176

(77) for resizing character fonts. In response to the selection of a font type, enlarging or resizing of the size of character fonts, adjusting the magnification ratio of an input field (76) or button (77), and the size of the enlarged input field (76) or button (77) in contrast with window (70).

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 27, Morgan discloses: *again initiate the selecting, capturing, detecting, adjusting, and rescaling--*"A new font is being dragged from the font paletteThe window 70 and the client area 74, the entry fields 76 and buttons 77 have all been resized " (col. 4, ln. 30-67, and Fig. 4A-B). Morgan teaches the opening of another input field (76) or button (77) for resizing character fonts and repeating the steps of capturing, detecting, adjusting, and rescaling as outlined previously in claim 27.

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 27, Morgan discloses: *the window is resized....and repositioned where the window horizontally and vertically exactly occupies the display--*"A new font is being dragged from the font paletteThe window 70 and the client area 74, the entry fields 76 and buttons 77 have all been resized " (col. 4, ln. 30-67, and Fig. 4A-B). Morgan teaches a well known title bar (80) with a well known maximize button (upper right hand, Fig. 4A) for resizing, and maximizing resized window to occupy exactly a the display area of display screen.

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 27, Morgan discloses: *the size of a character within the resized....window equals the original character size--*"the text within the title bar 80 and action bar 82 have not been resized" (col. 4, ln. 59-67, and Fig. 4A-B). Morgan teaches that the text of title bar (80), and action bar (82) was not resized together with the window (70).

Claim 31 is directed towards the method for resizing a window in response to a character size change found in claim 27, and is therefore similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 33, which depends on claim 27, Morgan discloses: *restoring the original view to the original position*--"the text within the title bar 80 and action bar 82 have not been resized" (col. 4, ln. 59-67, and Fig. 4A-B). Morgan teaches that the text of title bar (80), and action bar (82) was not resized together with the window (70).

Claim 34 is directed towards the method for repeating the steps of claim 33, and is therefore similarly rejected.

Claim 35 is directed towards the method for resizing a window in response to a character size change found in claim 1, and is therefore similarly rejected.

Claim 36 is directed towards the method for resizing a window in response to a character size change found in claim 1, and is therefore similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warnock et al. (Pat.# 5,634,064, 5/27/97), in view of Niles et al, hereinafter Niles (Pat.# 5,943,679, 8/28/99).

Regarding independent claim 1, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose: *An information processing apparatus for displaying at least a character or an image in a first intended area*.... Warnock et al disclose "an electronic document viewer...." (col. 2, ln. 38), "....when in

Art Unit: 2176

the article view mode, at least a portion of a selected article is displayed on the computer screen in an enhanced article view which facilitates the comfortable reading of the document..." (col. 2, ln. 48-52, col. 3, ln. 17-19, and col. 1, ln. 26-28). However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image" (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the display of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification a second window to display data in a first intended window p(i) of Niles, because Niles discloses "improved visualization technique displayed a 'focus page' (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document....." (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Moreover, Warnock et al disclose: "an electronic document viewer...." (col. 2, ln. 38), "....when in the article view mode, at least a portion of a selected article is displayed on the computer screen in an enhanced article view which facilitates the comfortable reading of the document..." (col. 2, ln. 48-52). Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *detection means for detecting whether a request for opening said second intended area is issued*. However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image....." (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the display of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification a second window to display data in a first intended window p(i) of Niles, because Niles discloses "improved visualization technique

Art Unit: 2176

displayed a 'focus page' (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document....." (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Moreover, Warnock et al disclose "...the displaying step causes the selected portion of the article to be automatically sized within the article view area to enhance its readability. This is often referred to as " zoom....." (col. 3, ln. 17-20). Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *determining means for determining a second magnification rate for said second intended area.....* However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image....." (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the display of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification of a second window (magnifier 59 or focus image) to display data in a first intended window p(i) of Niles, because Niles discloses "improved visualization technique displayed a 'focus page' (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document....." (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Moreover, Warnock et al disclose "Furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window " (col. 3, ln. 17-20). Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *enlarged display means for displaying said first intended area with said characters...in an enlarged form.....* However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image....." (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

Art Unit: 2176

in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the display of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification of a second window to display data in a first intended window p(i) of Niles, because Niles discloses "improved visualization technique displayed a 'focus page' (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document....." (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Warnock et al disclose "the article can be selected by a variety of modes including.....selecting a visible portion of an article from a document being displayed in the normal view. Preferably the displaying step causes the selected portion of the article....."zoom"....." (col. 3, ln. 17-20). Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *correcting the magnification rate upward*. However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image....." (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the display of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification of a second window to display data in a proportionately enlarged first intended window p(i) of Niles, because Niles discloses "improved visualization technique displayed a 'focus page' (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document....." (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Moreover, Warnock et al disclose *maintaining said second magnification rate as it is....--* "when in normal view mode, the document viewer displays at least a portion of the documentthat has the formatting and appearance intended by the publisher....." (col. 2, ln. 45-48).

Furthermore, Warnock et al disclose "when it is desired by the user to leave the article view mode, process control.....which determines whether the original view should be restored....." (col. 10, ln. 4-7). Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *means for correcting said magnification rate downward*..... However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image....." (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the display of images as taught by Warnock et al and downward magnification of a second window to by switching "the focus page" or "magnifier 59" to another page as taught by Niles, because Niles discloses "improved visualization technique displayed a 'focus page' (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document....." (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Warnock et al disclose "selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window....." (col. 3, ln. 27-30). Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *means for correcting said magnification rate downward*..... However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image....." (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the magnification of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification of a second window to by switching "the focus page" or "magnifier 59" to another page as taught by Niles, because Niles discloses "improved visualization technique displayed a 'focus page' (or a

focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document....." (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Regarding independent claim 4, the preamble, and the first limitation are directed towards an apparatus for implementing the apparatus of claim 1, and are similarly rejected.

Moreover, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *determining means for determining a second magnification rate*..... However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image....." (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the magnification of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification of the text characters in an area from the size of the characters and an area and its surrounding area on a window by switching "the focus page" or "magnifier 59" to another page as taught by Niles, because Niles discloses "improved visualization technique displayed a 'focus page' (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document....." (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Moreover, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *enlarged display means* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *enlarged display means*, because Warnock et al disclose " furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window " (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to Warnock et al, an article could be displayed "sized" or "zoomed" for better readability, hence a means for displaying the enlargement of the article would be needed to accomplish the desired enhancement.

Claim 5 is directed towards an apparatus for performing the functions of the apparatus in claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Warnock et al fail to disclose *said determining means calculates said magnification ratethe character displayed....first magnification rate is equal to the size of the character displayed in the intended area*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *such determining means*, because Warnock et al disclose. "when in normal view mode, the document viewer displays at least a portion of the documentthat has the formatting and appearance intended by the publisher....." (col. 2, ln. 45-48). This means that if the user was to open two windows in the normal view mode the two windows would have the same character size.

Furthermore, Warnock et al disclose "furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window " (col. 3, ln. 17-20) hence the display of a character in the enlarged form.

Regarding independent claim 7, the preamble, and the first limitation are directed towards an apparatus for implementing the apparatus of claim 1, and are similarly rejected.

Moreover, Warnock et al disclose "...the displaying step causes the selected portion of the article to be automatically sized within the article view area to enhance its readability. This is often referred to as " zoom....." (col. 3, ln. 17-20). Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *determining means for determining a second magnification rate.....* However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image....." (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the magnification of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification of the text characters in an area from the size of the characters and an area and its surrounding area on a window by switching “the focus page” or “magnifier 59” to another page as taught by Niles, because Niles discloses “improved visualization technique displayed a ‘focus page’ (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document.....” (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Moreover, Warnock et al disclose furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window” (col. 3, ln. 17-20). Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *enlarged display means* However, Niles discloses: “The pop-up magnifier 59...to persistently display the focus image.....” (col. 12, ln. 62-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and “a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device.....” (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the magnification of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification of the text characters in an area from the size of the characters and an area and its surrounding area on a window by switching “the focus page” or “magnifier 59” to another page as taught by Niles, because Niles discloses “improved visualization technique displayed a ‘focus page’ (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document.....” (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Warnock et al disclose “furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window” (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to Warnock et al, an enlarged article could be adjusted to fit to a specific window or screen size.

Regarding independent claim 9, the preamble is directed towards an apparatus for implementing the apparatus of claim 1, and is similarly rejected.

Moreover, Warnock et al disclose "...the other type of scroll is an article scroll.....a step 114 is used to reset the pointerto display a new portion of the article.....this new portion of the article is automatically panned and zoomed to fit within the article view area of the window....." (col. 9, ln. 46-55). In this previous quote, Warnock et al teach a means to reset a pointer in a document so as to scroll to and display a new portion of a document. Once the document has reached this new portion or *state*, the system then magnified or zoomed the portion for better readability—*detection means for detecting whether the trailing end of said intended area scrolled....has reached a state displayable on said display screen*. However, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose opening a second intended area. As the Examiner established in the rejection of claim 1, Niles teaches opening a second intended area. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Warnock et al, and Niles for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Moreover, Warnock et al disclose "...the other type of scroll is an article scroll.....a step 114 is used to reset the pointerto display a new portion of the article.....this new portion of the article is automatically panned and zoomed to fit within the article view area of the window....." (col. 9, ln. 46-55). Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *detection means for detecting whether.....said scrolling means has reached a displayable state and prohibition means for prohibiting said intended window from being further scrolled.....the trailing endis in a displayable state*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had such *prohibition scrolling means*, because this

would have enabled the Warnock's system scroll to the new intended portion of the document, wait for the document reach the displayable state and then had zoomed the document. *Scrolling and its prohibition means* was well known in the art at the time of the invention as shown by the references cited, but not applied in this Office Action. However, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose opening a second intended area. As the Examiner established in the rejection of claim 1, Niles teaches opening a second intended area. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Warnock et al, and Niles for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Warnock et al fail to disclose *memory means for storing the coordinates of at least.....* and *restoration means for restoring and displayingthe display state of said intended area*. However, Niles discloses: "The pop-up magnifier window 59, which is generally centered on the display screen...to persistently display the focus image....." (col. 12, ln. 59-67, and col. 13, ln. 1-37), and "a focus page (or focus image) p(i) that is selected by a user with an input device....." (col. 6, ln. 55-67, and col. 7, ln. 1-22). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the display of images as taught by Warnock et al and magnification of a second window centered on the screen to display data in a first intended window p(i) of Niles, because Niles discloses "improved visualization technique displayed a 'focus page' (or a focus image) at a legible resolution while displaying legible content of the other pages of the document....." (col. 3, ln. 36-47).

Claims 11-15 are directed towards a recording medium readable by a computer for performing the functions of the apparatus in claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 10 respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

Claims 16-23 are directed towards the same limitations of claim 10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 24-26 are directed towards recording medium readable by a computer for performing the functions of the apparatus in claim 10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan, in view of Barnes, "10 Minute Guide to Windows 3.1" (1992).

Regarding claim 32, Morgan discloses: Morgan teaches the selection, and capturing of original fonts into a region with an input field (76), or button (77). --"A new font is being dragged from the font palette 71 and is about to be dropped on the window 70" (col. 1, ln. 55-67, col. 4, ln. 4-67, and Fig. 4A-B). Morgan fails to explicitly teach *inhibiting scrolling of a second view...with only contents of the original view being scrolled into view*. Barnes teaches a well known windows with fonts selection fields containing scrolling bars ("cartridges"—Fig. 18.3, and "installed fonts"—Fig. 18.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Morgan and Barnes, because Morgan teaches above the input of enlarged fonts into GUIs without distorting its appearance, and to enable this input without the disturbance introduced by the activity of the scroll bar.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 5/14/2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "the present invention's windows are enlarged with a second magnification rate, which rate is determined based on

Art Unit: 2176

factors such as display size, user choice, character size, and proportional character size” p.9,L.26-30) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding claims 4-8, 13, and 21-22, and in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., “adjusts the magnification rate according to a character size...the pop-up window in claims 5, 8, and 30, resizes according to the magnification ratio” p.10,L.5-14) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding claims 2, and 16, and in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., “the second magnification ratio...is adjusted to fit the new window both horizontally and vertically into the window or screen” p.10,L.21-24) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding claims 5, and 16, the Applicant states that the “Examiner did not give weight to another distinguishing feature in the present invention....it resizes the new window according to the magnification ratio” p.10,L.29-31. The Examiner disagrees, because Niles teaches the magnifying of a document in a first window area, and displaying it in a magnified fashion in a

Art Unit: 2176

second larger window. Thus, enlarging said intended first area (c.12,L.62-67, c.13,L.1-67, and Fig.10).

Furthermore, the Applicant states that the “the Examiner incorrectly equated the ‘second magnification rate’ in the present invention with the second magnified pop-up window” p.11,L.17-24. The Examiner disagrees, because Niles teaches the display of the magnifying window 59 of Fig.10, with a magnified version of a first document—“magnification rate”-- as has been claimed by the Applicant. The Applicant merely claims the enlarging of a first area in a second area (claim 1,L.8-12), without specifying the type of magnification utilized.

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 27-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding claims 27, and 30-31, the Applicant note that Niles fails to teach the adjusting of “the magnification rate according to a character size” p.10,L.5-9. The Applicant is directed toward the rejections above, of these newly added claims over a newly found prior art.

Regarding claims 27-29, and 34-35, the Applicant note that Niles fails to teach “the second magnification ratio....is adjusted to fit the new window both horizontally and vertically into the window or screen” p.10,L.21-28. The Applicant is directed toward the rejections above, of these newly added claims over a newly found prior art.

Regarding claim 30, the Applicant note that Niles fails to teach “repositions a super-region or a subregion of an already enlarged view” p.11,L.1-2. The Applicant is directed toward the rejections above, of these newly added claims over a newly found prior art.

Regarding claims 28, and 36, the Applicant note that Niles fails to teach "recursively enlarge views" p.11,L.9-18. The Applicant is directed toward the rejections above, of these newly added claims over a newly found prior art.

Conclusion

14. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. MORGAN et al. (Pat. # 5,544,288), LEONG et al. (Pat. # 5,513,342), SMITH (Pat. # 5,751,283), ACKER et al. (Pat. # 5,671,378), and TORRES (Pat. # 5,001,697).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The

Art Unit: 2176

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

- (703) 308-6606, (for informal or draft communications for discussion only, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

7/26/01

Heather Herndon
HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100